



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/489,605	01/21/2000	William J. Baer	STL000023US1	6038

27896 7590 09/27/2002

EPSTEIN, EDELL, SHAPIRO, FINNAN & LYTLE, LLC
1901 RESEARCH BOULEVARD
SUITE 400
ROCKVILLE, MD 20850

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, CAM LINH T

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2171

DATE MAILED: 09/27/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/489,605

Applicant(s)

BAER ET AL.

Examiner

Cam-Linh T. Nguyen

Art Unit

2171

— The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address —

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 September 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 28 June 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

2. Claims 1 – 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ferrel et al (U.S. 6,199,082).

♦ As per claim 1, 6, 11

- “Providing a functional layer for interface with user interface” is referred same as “the publisher system 102” See Fig. 2, element 102, column 11 line 46 – 62, column 12 line 17 – 27. These functional modules communicate with user interface 182 by a network 122.
- “A data repository containing a plurality of content entities” See fig. 1 element 120, column 11 line 14 – 20.

Art Unit: 2171

- "A plurality of function modules" is referred same as "software components" which are elements 184, 186 – 190, 192 – 193 in fig. 2.
- "Each module for executing a function pertaining to the creation or manipulation of a compilation of content" See column 11 line 63 – column 12 line 16. Depends on the request of user 182, the workstation 180 will create or manipulate a compilation of content selected from the plurality of content entities, and returns this information to user concerning the compilation of content.

♦ As per claim 2, 7, 12,

- "A list of content entity identifier defining the content and the order of a compilation" See column 53 line 10 – 19, column 29 line 50 – 55.

♦ As per claim 3, 8, 13,

- "The function module manipulates the list to redefine the content or order of the compilation" Ferrel uses a tree structure to represents the entire structure of the title. User can manipulates the list of content by dragging and dropping each object's icon to redefine the content or order of the compilation (See Fig. 7, column 20 line 51 - 64).

♦ As per claim 4-5, 9-10, 14-15,

- "The compilation is hierarchically structured and wherein one of the function modules creates an outline of containers" See Fig. 7. Figure 7 is a hierarchically structure; it can be thought of as a folder which can contain other sections (sub-sections), search objects, style sheets, pages, and content (see column 20 line 18-65). The element 404 is an outline, and uses standard Explorer views, as well

as a special view built for the window 400, which sorts according to a user-defined order and allows the user to change the order by dragging and dropping each objects' icon. Figure 4 is an example of container hierarchy (see column 15 line 45-67).

♦ As per claim 16 - 18,

- "The function modules calculates a price for the compilation of content" See column 3 line 18 – 20, column 29 line 1 – 3.

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 09/02/2002 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Figure 2 of Ferrel contradicts in large part the arguments of the Applicant about the lacks of Ferrel. Applicant argues that Ferrel reference fails to teach a functional layer that interfaces over a network with user interface and that interfaces with a data repository that contains a plurality of content entities. However, referring to Fig. 2, clearly a user 182 interfaces with a workstation 180, which communicates with the functional modules and data repositories of 102. The publisher 102 receives the request from user 182, and returns information concerning the compilation of content.

Conclusion

1. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 2171

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

2. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cam-Linh T. Nguyen whose telephone number is 703-305- 1951. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 8:00 am to 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic, can be reached on (703) 308- 1436. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703- 746- 7239.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703- 305- 3900.

Cam-Linh Nguyen
Art Unit 2171


WAYNE AMSBURY
PRIMARY PATENT EXAMINER

LN